

REMARKS/DISCUSSION:

This Amendment A is being filed within three months after the shortened statutory period for response that ended on December 15, 2006. Accordingly, a Petition for a Three-Month Extension of Time is made a part of the electronic filing for this Amendment A.

By this Amendment A, claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Original claims 1 and 2 have been amended and claims 4-14 are new.

Amendment and/or cancellation of claims is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims previously presented. Further, Applicant(s) reserves the right to prosecute the subject matter of such claims in continuation and/or divisional applications.

Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. This Amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 stands rejected as being indefinite as noted in the Office Action. Claim 1 has been amended to correct, *inter alia*, the indefiniteness rejection.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-3 stand rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,254,623 to Haibel Jr. as noted in the Office action.

Applicant respectfully transverses the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-3 over Haibel because, according to Applicant's understanding, the Haibel reference neither teaches nor suggests all of the claimed the elements of the Applicant's invention. It is Applicant's understanding that a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or

inherently described, in a single prior art reference. See for example MPEP 2131.

Under MPEP 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim, and the elements must be arranged as required by the claim. Under this standard, Applicant submits that Haibel et al. fails to anticipate amended independent claims 1 and 2.

Independent claims 1 and 2 include the following limitation:

one-half wave segment comprising a first portion, a second portion and a third portion, and the first portion comprising a first cross-sectional area and the second and third portions comprising a second cross-sectional area.

The Haibel reference does not, according to Applicant's understanding, teach or suggest such a geometric configuration *within a one-half wave segment* (*emphasis added*).

[REMAINDER OF PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

Conclusion

Applicant submits that in view of the discussion, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 102 have been overcome and that the invention is now patentable over the cited prior. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider all rejections and pass this case to issue.

Should any minor points remain prior to issuance of a Notice of Allowance, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required to Account No. 10-0750/END-5009/VEK.

Respectfully submitted,

Verne E. Kreger, Jr., Reg. #35231/

Verne E. Kreger, Jr.

Verne E. Kreger, Jr.
Attorney for the Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 35,231

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
513 337-3295
DATED: March 8, 2007